There were some people at that time who advised my taking the Judiciary chairmanship. They felt that the people of our State were more interested in my work on the Judiciary Committee than they would be in my work on the Foreign Relations Committee.

WHY I CHOSE FOREIGN RELATIONS POST

But for two basic reasons, I chose the Foreign Relations post:

In the first place, it would enable me to render service on behalf of the greatest single goal of all—the goal of world peace, preventing a dreadful atomic-hydrogen bomb conflict.

And in the second place, if I did not choose the Foreign Relations assignment, the next ranking Republican on it—who would become chairman—had either been lukewarm or hostile to the seaway.

With a seaway supporter at the helm, however, of the full committee, I could arrange for a favorable seaway membership on the subcommittee. This I promptly did.

And it was not too long before we secured not only a favorable report in the seaway subcommittee, but a favorable report in the full committee, and then favorable action in the full Senate.

THE DEBATE OVER A 1-STEP OR 2-STEP BILL

Let us recall, too, that for a time, there was some concern over our strategy in the proseaway camp itself.

There were friends among our seaway supporters who said that we had to adopt a combined 1-step bill, so to speak. They wanted it to include the upper channels (affecting the States beyond Lake Erie) as well as the main navigation works on the lower seaway—in the International Rapids section.

I personally opposed that strategy for a number of reasons:

1. In the first place, for years and years, we had been defeated in our effort to try to combine both phases.

We felt, therefore, that our chances would be infinitely improved, if we secured approval of the seaway in two separate stages—first, the main navigation works, and secondly, the upper channel work beyond Lake Erie—for ourselves and other upper Lakes States.

I pointed out, for example, that the main navigation works would be paid for by self-liquidating bonds (retired by toll payments), whereas the channels would be paid for by Treasury appropriations.

To combine the two financial phases in one bill would tend to confuse the issue somewhat, and our opponents would quickly exploit the mixed nature of the bill.

2. Secondly, I knew that, if once we won the major battle, we would get quick approval of the upper channels.

OUR QUICK VICTORY ON THE CHANNELS

I am delighted to say that my plans and strategy worked out exactly as they were intended.

We did secure the passage of the main seaway law. It was signed by the President at the White House in a historic ceremony on May 13, 1954.

And then, the channel bill—which others and I promptly introduced—was approved in the 84th Congress. As a matter of fact, contrary to the unfounded fears which had been expressed by some of our seaway supporters, the channel bill went through—with absolutely no opposition whatsoever. There was not a single voice lifted against it either in the House of Representatives or in the Senate. It passed the Senate on the Unanimous Consent Calendar, meaning that, just as I had predicted, no one whatsoever opposed it, (once the main seaway fight had been won).

Now, fortunately, we are making good progress in the actual engineering work. I am in close touch with the Seaway Development Corporation and with the Corps of Engineers as work proceeds. All possible speed is, of course, essential.

Just a few weeks ago, it was my privilege to deliver the main address at the impressive dedication—near Massena, N. Y.—of Eisenhower lock on the St. Lawrence Seaway.

I was pleased at that time to receive a glowing tribute from an official spokesman for the administration, Assistant Secretary of the Army, George H. Roderick. He kindly referred to me as the "Father of the St. Lawrence Seaway law."

But the battle for the seaway was a combined effort—throughout.

It was not any single man's accomplishment. It represented the successful teamwork by our Great Lakes States, and, in particular, by united forces in the State of Wisconsin.

CONCLUSION

Teamwork, cooperation, those will be the keynotes for Wisconsin and Great Lakes prosperity in the years to come.

And in the time up ahead, as summer festivals roll around again, we will have ever more to be thankful for, ever more over which to rejoice.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, JULY 10, 1956

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Most merciful and gracious God, we thank Thee for the privilege of prayer and its power to fortify and strengthen us when the struggle of life is difficult and our problems are hard to solve.

We humbly acknowledge that our minds are frequently thronged with a multitude of disturbing and disconcerting thoughts and we feel ourselves wavering between conflicting and opposite decisions.

Constrain us with a determination to bring all our plans and purposes, our desires and longings, into harmony with Thy divine will, in which is our peace.

Grant that we may be eager to invoke and worthy to receive Thy blessing and benediction upon everything which we shall endeavor to do during this day for the welfare of our country and all mankind.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 3449. An act relating to the reinvestment by air carriers of the proceeds from the sale or other disposition of certain operating property and equipment.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1871. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to reimburse the Post Office Department for the transmission of official Government-mail matter, approved August 15, 1953 (67 Stat. 614), and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H. R. 483) entitled "An act to amend the Army-Navy Public Health Service Medical Officer Procurement Act of 1947, as amended, so as to provide for appointment of doctors of osteopathy in the Medical Corps of the Army and Navy," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. SALTONSTALL, and Mrs. SMITH of Maine to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9893) entitled "An act to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes."

MANNER IN WHICH ANTITRUST SUIT AGAINST GENERAL MOTORS WAS ANNOUNCED

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, permit me to call the attention of the House of Representatives to an editorial which appeared in the Cleveland Press of July 6, 1956, entitled "Political Corn," commenting upon Attorney General Herbert Brownell's television performance last Wednesday night when he went on a Corn Products-sponsored television program to announce that the Justice Department would file an antitrust suit against the General Motors Corp.

The preparation of this suit must have taken most of the Attorney General's time during the past 3½ years. You can almost bank on the assumption that it was most adroitly prepared with a confused cause of action and that the service of summons will inadvertently be made on the wrong person, perhaps some unsuspecting motorist.

It should further be a subject of congressional concern that public news and information, particularly information of such far-reaching importance as an antitrust suit prepared by a Republican Attorney General against the great General Motors Corp., should be distributed by public officials on private television time. News has a property value and the distribution of it on a private advertiser's television time is a conversion of public property in the news for the private profit or advantage of an advertiser and/or other persons. Releases of public information by public officials should always be made in a thoroughly public manner.

The Press editorial is as follows:

POLITICAL CORN

If Secretary Ezra Benson were to go on a General Motors-sponsored TV program to announce that the Agriculture Department had decided to blacklist Corn Products Co.—

We doubt honest old Ezra would do such a thing, but if he did—

Well, it would be on all fours with Attorney General Herbert Brownell's performance Wednesday night, when he went on a Corn Products-sponsored TV program to announce that the Justice Department would file an antitrust suit against General Motors.

It might be good politics, because this is an election year and some farm spokesmen have been accusing Ezra of loving the food processors more than he loves the farmers. But, repeating, we don't think Ezra would play politics that way.

And, of course, we have no way of knowing how long Brownell carried that official news item around in his hot little hand before he stepped up to the TV camera to perform a governmental act under the auspices of a sponsor with a name appropriate to the performance.

But we do know that Brownell attained his present position by his skill in politics, that General Motors has been a large and growing corporation through the 3½ years Brownell has been Attorney General, that Democrats have been accusing the Eisenhower administration of favoring big business, and that Brownell didn't announce his suit against the symbol of big business until well along in an election year.

The traditional way for the Justice Department to break the news of an antitrust action is to file the complaint, making it a matter of court record, and give out a press release or hold a press conference available equally to all media of public information, explaining the reasons for the suit.

But Brownell chose an unorthodox way of making his announcement, arousing controversy that might possibly draw more attention to the idea that the Republicans, in this election year, are hellbent for protecting the little fellows against the big fellow.

For his performance, Brownell received a leather-bound, 20-volume encyclopedia, and newspaper reporters participating in the Corn Products press conference received a cash honorarium for 30 minutes of acting the role they are paid all week to do for their own newspapers.

However you grind it, it's corn.

EX-SENATOR CAIN AND THE SECURITY PROGRAM

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and to extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I think it is unanimously agreed by those who have followed our security program carefully that no one has contributed more during the last 18 months toward putting commonsense and fair play into that system than has former Senator Harry P. Cain, who is a member of the Control Board on Subversive Activities. Senator Cain has worked tirelessly and with great courage to improve our security procedures.

His appointment expires on August 1 of this year. If I were a Republican and were asked what the President has done to improve the security system, I would reply, "He appointed Senator Cain." In my opinion, there is no better test of the President's sincerity in this matter than the Cain appointment.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN RELATIVES OF UNITED STATES CITIZENS

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk House Joint Resolution 456 for the relief of certain relatives of United States citizens with Senate amendments thereto and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 7, strike out "under" and insert "and upon compliance with."

Page 2, line 4, after "Huffman", insert "Stella W. Janinis."

Page 2, line 4, after "Jackson", insert "Reinhold H. Meric."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN ALIENS

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk House Joint Resolution 580 for the relief of certain aliens with a Senate amendment thereto and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 7, strike out "Lee Fay Fan."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN ALIENS

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk House Joint Resolution 616 for the relief of certain aliens, with Senate amendments thereto and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, strike out lines 8 to 12, inclusive.

Page 2, line 1, strike out "3" and insert "2."

Page 2, line 6, strike out "4" and insert "3."

Page 2, line 11, strike out "5" and insert "4."

Page 2, line 16, strike out "6" and insert "5."

Page 2, line 21, strike out "7" and insert "6."

Page 3, line 1, strike out "8" and insert "7."

Page 3, line 6, strike out "9" and insert "8."

Page 3, line 11, strike out "10" and insert "9."

Page 3, line 16, strike out "11" and insert "10."

Page 3, line 21, strike out "12" and insert "11."

Page 4, line 1, strike out "13" and insert "12."

Page 4, line 6, strike out "14" and insert "13."

Page 4, line 11, strike out "15" and insert "14."

Page 4, line 16, strike out "16" and insert "15."

Page 4, strike out lines 21 to 25, inclusive, and insert:

"SEC. 16. For the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Gertraud Anna Giulio, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Frank Joseph Horak, a citizen of the United States."

Page 5, line 1, strike out "18" and insert "17."

Page 5, line 6, strike out "19" and insert "18."

Page 5, line 11, strike out "20" and insert "19."

Page 5, line 16, strike out "21" and insert "20."

Page 5, line 21, strike out "22" and insert "21."

Page 6, after line 2, insert:

"SEC. 22. For the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Jose Boo Lopez, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Patrick Louis Perry, a citizen of the United States."

Page 6, after line 2, insert:

"SEC. 23. For the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Lim Ginwey, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Lim Nuey, a citizen of the United States."

Page 6, after line 2, insert:

"SEC. 24. For the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Shiu Ming Ma, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Donald Herbert Deppe, a citizen of the United States."

Page 6, after line 2, insert:

"SEC. 25. For the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Roland F. Petersen, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Vernon L. Petersen, a citizen of the United States."

Page 6, after line 2, insert:

"SEC. 26. For the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Lampros Lazaridis, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Lazar and Bernice Christoff, citizens of the United States."

Page 6, after line 2, insert:

"SEC. 27. For the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Paz Tupas Meeker shall be held and considered to be the minor natural-born alien child of C. A. Meeker, a citizen of the United States."

Page 6, after line 2, insert:

"SEC. 28. For the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Luciana Papa Powell, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of James M. Powell and Camille Powell, citizens of the United States."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADVANCEMENT OF MAJ. GEN. HANFORD MacNIDER TO LIEUTENANT GENERAL

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 11677) to provide for the advancement of Maj. Gen. Hanford MacNider, United States Army Reserve, retired, to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, would the gentleman from Georgia, our distinguished chairman, explain briefly the bill or have its author do so?

Mr. VINSON. I suggest, inasmuch as I cleared the matter with the gentleman before I called it up, that the distinguished gentleman from Missouri, who is quite familiar with this bill, should briefly state to the House the distinguished military career of this outstanding general.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I think all Members are aware that Hanford MacNider, of Iowa, is one of the greatest soldiers that this country has ever produced, having served in both World War I and World War II, and being wounded many times on the battlefield. Not only are the Members of the Iowa delegation but many of the Members all over the Nation, as well as some of our highest military men in the country, are heartily in favor of granting this recognition to a very outstanding and great American. I want to say that the bill will not cost the taxpayers one dime. It merely promotes him from major general to lieutenant general; wholly an honor but an honor richly deserved and written in sacrifice and blood. I am confident that every true American who loves his country will rejoice that this high recognition and signal honor is being bestowed by an appreciative Congress and a grateful people upon a stalwart, fearless, and exemplary soldier, a sterling patriot, and a great and good man.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, it so happens that Hanford MacNider and I both served in World War II; in fact, we slept in the same dugout at one time. He was a captain in the 9th Infantry, 2d Division, and I was a second lieutenant in the 15th Field Artillery. I was assigned as the liaison officer to the 9th Infantry. Of all the wonderful fighters and brave men, Hanford MacNider was one of the best, and I heartily endorse this bill.

Mr. SHORT. I thank the gentleman. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say, too, to the gentleman that I have been told by some of our highest ranking officers that he is the greatest fighting man they have ever known, coming back from the battlefield to the dugout with blood actually running out of his shoes and refusing to go to a hospital.

Mr. KEAN. He was what we colloquially call a fighting fool.

Mr. SHORT. He was and still is.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa, the author of the bill. And I want to congratulate and thank him for his interest in this matter.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I hope this bill will be approved. Hanford MacNider, in my opinion, is one of this country's greatest living nonprofessional fighting men. Hanford MacNider has been awarded the Distinguished Service Cross; not the Distinguished Service Medal but the Distinguished Service Cross, with two clusters awarded for combat above and beyond the call of duty. He is a former Ambassador to Canada; a former national commander of the American Legion and of the Iowa Department of the American Legion. Major General MacNider has had a long and illustrious career, both as a military man and a civilian. As the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] has stated, this advancement to the grade of lieutenant general is purely a recognition of the honor that is due a great nonprofessional soldier. It should be noted that the bill explicitly provides that this advancement will not permit an increase of a single dime in the retirement pay of General MacNider.

I wish to take this opportunity to thank Mr. VINSON, chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, and the ranking minority member of the committee, Mr SHORT, for making it possible to consider this bill today honoring as it does one of the distinguished citizens of the Nation and the congressional district which it is my privilege to represent.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, if I might add one word, there are many Members of this House who, like the gentleman from New Jersey, served with Hanford MacNider. I never did have that privilege or honor, but I have met him, and I know that he has been considered on different occasions seriously in years gone by as a presidential possibility.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, everyone knows of the great career of General MacNider, one of the outstanding generals of American history. I know that General MacNider will derive great pleasure and satisfaction in the knowledge that this bill, brought up out of order, has passed the House unanimously, conveying to him and to the entire country the great respect that all Members of the House, without regard to party, have for him and the admiration they have for the man himself, and the military leader.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I should like to say how extremely glad I am that this body is about to pass this bill. Gen. Hanford MacNider is known all over this country and abroad for his great work. His contribution has been just as great since the war as it was during the war, during his gallant fighting days. America should do him all honor. I have known him and his lovely wife for years. Their friends are legion and will rejoice over this appreciation of this great man.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Maj. Gen. Hanford MacNider, United States Army Reserve (retired), shall be advanced on the retired list to the grade of lieutenant general effective as of date of enactment of this act.

SEC. 2. Nothing contained in this act shall be deemed to increase the retired or retirement pay received by the said Maj. Gen. Hanford MacNider and no other benefits shall accrue to him by virtue of the enactment thereof.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary have permission to sit during general debate tomorrow and Thursday.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Public Works have until midnight tonight to file sundry reports.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, FISCAL YEAR 1957

Mr. SMITH of Virginia, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 584, Rept. No. 2648), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

Resolved, That during the consideration of the bill (H. R. 12138) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes, all points of order against the bill are hereby waived.

PERMISSION TO SIT DURING GENERAL DEBATE

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Public Works have permission to sit during general debate tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

ASSISTANCE TO CERTAIN NON-FEDERAL INSTITUTIONS FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF FACILITIES FOR RESEARCH

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 577 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 849) to provide assistance to certain non-Federal institutions for construction of facilities for research in crippling and killing diseases such as cancer, heart disease, poliomyelitis, nervous disorders, mental illness, arthritis and rheumatism, blindness, cerebral palsy, tuberculosis, multiple sclerosis, epilepsy, cystic fibrosis, and muscular dystrophy, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider without intervention of any point of order the substitute amendment recommended by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce now in the bill and such substitute for the purpose of amendment shall be considered under the 5-minute rule as an original bill. At the conclusion of such consideration the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any of the amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or committee substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ELLSWORTH], and at this time I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 577 makes in order the consideration of S. 849 to provide assistance to certain non-Federal institutions for the construction of facilities for research in crippling and killing diseases. The resolution provides for an open rule and 1 hour of general debate. It also provides that it shall be in order to consider without intervention of any point of order the substitute amendment recommended by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and the substitute shall be considered as an original bill for the purposes of amendment. Any Member may demand a separate vote on any of the amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or committee substitute.

The bill, as amended, authorizes a 3-year grant-in-aid program on a matching basis of not to exceed $30 million for each of the 3 years to assist public and nonprofit institutions in the construction and equipping of facilities to engage in research in the sciences related to health.

As amended, the bill sets up a National Advisory Council on Health Research Facilities. The Council will have the Surgeon General as chairman and an officer of the National Science Foundation. There will be 12 members appointed by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. Of the 12, 4 will be selected from the general public and 8 from among leading medical, dental, and scientific authorities.

The bill outlines certain factors which the Council must take into consideration when applications are submitted to assure equitable distribution of the grants. The Council shall, within 6 months after enactment of the bill, set up general regulations covering eligibility of institutions and the terms and conditions for approving applications. Also, the Council is to make annual reports to Congress summarizing its activities under this legislation.

A committee amendment provides for the recapture of funds if within 10 years after construction of any facility the applicant ceases to be a public or nonprofit institution, or ceases to be used for the purposes for which it was constructed.

A noninterference provision is included as a committee amendment to preclude any attempts to place such research facilities under Federal direction.

The committee unanimously approved the bill as amended. There was no opposition before the Rules Committee, and I urge the adoption of House Resolution 577.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to speak out of order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, not 75 Members are in the House at the moment. My assumption is that the lack of attendance is due to the effort to get an early adjournment, and the absent Members are either in committees or working on research problems so as to be better prepared to pass on legislation when it does come up.

The difficulty in understanding some of the bills that come before the House is due in part at least to the fact that committees of the House are holding hearings, hearings that continue from day to day almost continuously. It would not seem to be an exaggeration to state that some of these hearings have a political tinge, not red, but a sort of a pinkish color to them; that is to say, along the line of political propaganda. I am not talking about communism or anything of that kind, so please do not let me be misunderstood.

For example, the Committee on Government Operations through subcommittees, I think there are three subcommittees sitting today. We started out with the Chudoff subcommittee as it was originally authorized by a letter from the chairman of one of the Senate committees who told us to go into the question of the disposal of timber owned by the Government. That was fine. One of the objectives was to learn whether the inventory of the national timber was down to date. Another was to learn whether it was advisable to have area harvesting and manufacturing of the timber. Another was whether there should be access roads. That was all right. Another was whether there should be a cut which would permit and give an annual cut in the coming years. That was all right. All were questions which were, and are, vital to the Northwest. But those hearings degenerated, and I use that word advisedly, into a political attack upon the Department of the Interior. The digging up and rehashing of a charge and an issue that was decided out in the Northwest some 2 years ago. If there was any remedy for what had happened, if what happened was wrong, then the Department of Justice could have been appealed to 2 years ago or even before that, but no such appeal was taken. They waited until this session of Congress. Then this subcommittee, staffed by former disgruntled officials and employees of the Department of the Interior, went off on a political tangent in an effort to help elect certain members of the opposition party—when I speak of the opposition party I mean the Democratic Party—and to defeat certain members of the Republican Party at the coming November election.

Look where we are getting now. Here we are in the last 2 or 3 weeks of this session of the House. Bill after bill is coming before us for determination. Some of them carry millions if not billions of dollars. Yet as stated just a moment ago, there are less than 75 Members on the floor. I am not critical nor do I want to make a point of order when we go into Committee of the Whole if we do or when the bills are called for consideration. I do not want to make a point of order at this time while the House is in session. But, Mr. Speaker, because I realize that the Members are away today working in committee or in their offices with this monumental load that is bearing down on them and despite the fact they are so inadequately paid, with so little time to attend to their duties a quorum should be present when legislation as important as that which is pending—but look, why should the Committee on Government Operations through three subcommittees or more be holding sessions day after day, especially when none is considering legislation which should be enacted before adjournment? The Chudoff committee served notice, I think it was last night, that beginning next Monday they would hold hearings every forenoon and every afternoon. On what? Private-power companies. That committee has already put out a report, and I expect to speak on that later tomorrow, maybe today if some more of the Members get back from the arduous tasks they are now on, calling attention to the fact that the committee put out a report charging a conspiracy between the Department of the Interior and the private-power companies. That is the report adopted by the Committee on Government Operations which has been released to the press. True—true, 5 members of the majority—Democrats all of them—disagreed with some phases of the report. So while the report purported to be signed and was signed, as I assume, by 16 Members——

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. May I have another 5 minutes?

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I thank the gentleman. That obviates any necessity of calling a quorum and will not take nearly as long as having to have the Members present. As I stated before, I do not want to take the Members away from their desks and offices and committee rooms and from the Congressional Library where they are doing the necessary research work and consulting with the department officials and the executive agencies trying to get information to enable them to form an accurate judgment on pending legislation. I do not want to do that. Far, far be it for me to do anything to hinder them from working today, especially when the task is so difficult—oh, no, they should not be called over here—they should not be called over here to vote on any bill no matter how much it might carry in the way of appropriations, until today's labors have been finished.

But, now back to these 5 Members of the majority party who filed disagreeing or more properly additional views—the report was adopted by 17 members of the committee—and if you subtract the 5 from the 17 then add the 5 to the 12 minority members, do you see where you get? The majority is gone—wiped out. So the report becomes the report of 16, 5 of whom are not in wholehearted approval of all of it. And 4 of the 5 expressly stated that the committee, made up of their own political bedfellows, had held hearings and condemned the private power companies without ever having given the companies a hearing.

Now that subcommittee is off again and beginning next Monday every morning and every afternoon and every day while the House is in session, mind you, while the House is in session, it intends to hold hearings in an attempt to prove their charge that a wicked, vicious—if my colleague, the gentleman from New York, could give me a few additional words to describe it—that a conspiracy—I fail for want of words to express it—I say they have already determined and reported that a wicked conspiracy exists. Now, lo and behold, next week and the week after, morning and afternoon, they intend to hold hearings to substantiate the report that they have already given out. They wish to seek and find evidence to support a charge they made—a verdict of guilty which they rendered without a hearing. I wonder what my young friend from California [Mr. LIPSCOMB] who has just come here so recently, and who has shown himself to be such an active and able—I am sorry there is not room on the ticket for 2 vice presidential candidates so that California could again put on the ticket a man of such outstanding ability as our friend and colleague [Mr. LIPSCOMB], who has made outstanding contributions to the Congress since he came here. Some of us older ones who are fading just rely on the good judgment, the outstanding ability of these young men to help us out when as today the load grows heavy and difficult. The only thing I can think of at the moment which distracts from my pleasure is that it is unfortunate that he cannot be in two places at once—must be here on the floor instead of working in the Library or on committee. But we all assume he has very religiously attended all of these committee hearings and rendered valuable service because of his experience in the legislature of the State of California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I just want to concur in what the gentleman said about our colleague——

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. About the committee—about the committee report?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. About Mr. LIPSCOMB.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Oh.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I want to pay tribute to his constant attendance in committee and the hard work that he has done.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. And the exceptionally good work—you concur in that, do you not—the exceptionally good and efficient work? Yes; I notice you nodding in the affirmative. I want that to show in the RECORD because I think it might be gratifying to him to receive such an outstanding commendation from an experienced outstanding Member from his own State of California and who is so aware of our colleague's exceptionally fine record here.

The Committee on Government Operations under the House rules has permission to sit when the House is in session. That is the present rule, but I think it is unfortunate when so many committee hearings are held so near the end of the session.

Certainly as one Member to another, permit me to ask, Is it right to hold committee hearings day in and day out this last couple of weeks of the session, especially when the hearings have nothing to do with pending legislation? How can we do justice to our constituents by procedure which takes us off the floor? How can we perform our tasks here on the floor if every day we are to have these committee hearings? It is very disagreeable to any Member to be forced to make a point of no quorum. But if that is necessary in order to legislate intelligently then it must be done by someone.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, with reference to the pending House Resolution 577, we find no objection whatever to the adoption of the rule on this side of the aisle. The bill is a worthwhile piece of legislation, which we hope will be adopted.

I yield back the balance of my time, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HEALTH AMENDMENTS ACT OF 1956

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 580) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 3958) to improve the health of the people by assisting in increasing the number of adequately trained professional and practical nurses and professional public health personnel, assisting in the development of improved methods of care and treatment in the field of mental health, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ELLSWORTH], and at this time I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 580 makes in order the consideration of S. 3958, the Health Amendments Act of 1956. The resolution provides for an open rule and 1 hour of general debate.

The bill provides five programs designed to increase the supply of health personnel and health facilities, and to improve the methods by which certain health services are furnished.

Title I is intended to stimulate the training of more public health specialists by establishing a 3-year Federal program providing graduate traineeships for physicians, engineers, nurses, and other professional health personnel. The cost of this program is estimated at $1 million during the first year and double that amount during the second and third years.

Title II establishes a 3-year Federal program providing advanced training to professional nurses. The Federal grants would be awarded to the training institutions who would select the individuals to receive the traineeship awards. The estimated cost during the first year is approximately $2 million and it is expected the cost in the second and third years would increase.

Title III establishes a 5-year program of Federal matching grants to States for expanding and improving vocational educational training programs for practical nurses. For the first 2 years of the program the matching provisions would require at least 1 State dollar for every 3 Federal-grant dollars, and for the remaining 3 years dollar-for-dollar matching would be required. An appropriation of $5 million annually would be authorized for this program.

Title IV of the bill will extend for 2 additional years the Hospital Survey and Construction Act, as amended, which would otherwise expire on June 30, 1957. This act authorizes an annual appropriation of $150 million for the construction of public and other nonprivate hospitals. An amendment to the act in 1953 authorized an additional appropriation of $60 million for construction of diagnostic centers, chronic disease centers, rehabilitation facilities, and nursing homes.

Title V authorizes the Surgeon General to make special project grants for the support of investigations, experiments, and demonstrations in the field of mental health with special emphasis placed on projects designed to improve the operation and administration of State institutions for the care and treatment of the mentally ill. In the 1957 budget provision is made for the submission of a budget request of $1,500,000 for special mental health project needs. This request is contingent upon the enactment of title V of this bill.

The committee report complies with the Ramseyer rule and I urge the adoption of House Resolution 580.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 580 makes in order a bill which appears to be very worthwhile. There is no objection on this side to the enactment of the rule. The bill should certainly be considered and passed.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Can a Member be recognized on the bill itself for an amendment?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. When the bill is taken up for consideration; yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I wanted to be sure that I got in in time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will undoubtedly be recognized.

RIVERS AND HARBORS AND FLOOD CONTROL CONSTRUCTION

Mr. MADDEN, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 585 Rept. No. 2656), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 12080) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Public Works, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF DENTAL RESEARCH

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 579 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 3246) to increase the amount authorized for the erection and equipment of suitable and adequate buildings and facilities for the use of the National Institute of Dental Research. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed hour , to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MADDEN: Page 1, line 9, preceding the word "hour", insert the figure "1."

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ELLSWORTH], and yield myself such time as I may use.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 579 makes in order the consideration of S. 3246, to increase the amount authorized for the National Institute of Dental Research. The resolution provides for an open rule and 1 hour of general debate on the bill.

S. 3246 as passed by the Senate, provided that section 5 of the National Dental Research Act of 1948 be amended to read $5 million instead of $2 million. The House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee reported this measure with an amendment making the amount authorized $4 million.

The amount is authorized for the erection and equipment of buildings and facilities for the National Institute of Dental Research at the National Institutes of Health at Bethesda. The program for the expansion of dental-research facilities was authorized in 1948 and plans for the buildings were drawn. Construction was postponed due to the Korean conflict. Since that time building costs have increased considerably and it is believed by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce that additional funds will be required to make possible the construction of the planned buildings and facilities.

The committee report complies with the Ramseyer rule, and I urge the adoption of the resolution so consideration may be given this bill.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, this resolution makes in order legislation having to do with the National Institute of Dental Research. We have no objection to the adoption of the resolution on this side.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

WASHOE RECLAMATION PROJECT, NEVADA AND CALIFORNIA

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 581 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 10643) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Washoe reclamation project, Nevada and California. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes of my time to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ELLSWORTH], and at this time I yield myself such time as I desire.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 581 makes in order the consideration of H. R. 10643, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate and maintain the Washoe project in Nevada and California. Enactment of this legislation will also permit the construction of flood control works in the Truckee Valley which were authorized in the Flood Control Act of 1954, with construction contingent upon authorization of the Washoe project.

The resolution provides for an open rule and 1 hour debate on the bill.

This multiple-purpose project on the eastern slope of the Sierra Nevada will provide irrigation, power, flood control, public health, recreation and fish and wildlife benefits through regulation of the stream flow and storage of snowmelt flood waters on the East Carson and Little Truckee Rivers and drainage of

surplus ground waters in some areas of the basins.

The legislation contains certain other provisions. The States of Nevada and California are negotiating a compact with respect to the waters of the Truckee and Carson Rivers, both involved in the development of the Washoe project. Language in the bill assures that the future water needs in the Little Truckee River watershed in California will be met, and additional language provides that when the compact is completed the operation of the Washoe project will be in conformance with the compact.

The total cost of the project is $43,558,000. Seventeen million, one hundred and eight thousand dollars will be allocated to irrigation and drainage and, up to the ability of the users to repay, and after suitable development periods for various project lands, the repayment would be made under 50-year repayment contracts and would total $8,180,000 over the period. The power investment of $18,209,000 would be repaid in 50 years, with interest. Net power revenues accruing after payment of the power investment with interest would repay that part of the irrigation and drainage allocation beyond the repayment ability of the water users. The allocation of $6,141,000 for flood control, $100,000 for recreation and $2 million for the development of fish and wildlife resources would be nonreimbursable.

I urge the adoption of House Resolution 581 so that the House may proceed to the consideration of H. R. 10643.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I know of no opposition to the rule on this side.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRODUCTION OF TUNGSTEN, ASBESTOS, FLUORSPAR, AND COLUMBIUM-TANTALUM IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. TRIMBLE, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 586, Rept. No. 2657), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 3982) to provide for the maintenance of production of tungsten, asbestos, fluorspar, and columbium-tantalum in the United States, its Territories, and possessions, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider without the intervention of any point of order the substitute amendment recommended by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs now in the bill, and such substitute for the purpose of amendment shall be considered under the 5-minute rule as an original bill. At the conclusion of such consideration the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any of the amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or committee substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

AUTHORIZING LOAN OF NAVAL VESSELS TO FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 582 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 11613) to authorize the loan of naval vessels to the Governments of the Federal Republic of Germany, Greece, Portugal, Spain, and friendly far eastern nations, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes of my time to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ELLSWORTH], and at this time yield myself such time as I may use.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution makes in order the consideration of the bill, H. R. 11613.

The purpose of the bill is to authorize the President to lend 2 destroyers and 2 destroyer escorts to the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany, 2 submarines to the Government of Greece, 2 destroyer escorts to the Government of Portugal, and 2 destroyers to the Government of Spain for a period of 5 years, and at his discretion for an additional period of not to exceed 5 years. The bill further would extend the authority of the current law whereby the President, until December 31, 1956, is authorized to lend not to exceed 25 naval vessels not larger than destroyers to friendly far eastern nations, by providing a 2-year extension until December 31, 1958, and by increasing the number of such vessels to 50.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may use.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 582 makes in order the bill, H. R. 11613. According to the testimony given in the Rules Committee this is necessary in the interest of our national security. There is no objection to adoption of the rule on this side.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. How many vessels are involved in this?

Mr. ELLSWORTH. The resolution pending does not state. I cannot answer the gentleman's question.

The bill reads:

To authorize the loan of naval vessels to the Governments of the Federal Republic of Germany, Greece, Portugal, Spain, and friendly far eastern nations.

Mr. GROSS. Are these modern vessels? Does the gentleman have any idea what they are, whether they come out of the mothball fleet or what they are?

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I am unable to answer the gentleman's question. The matter before the House is whether or not the House will agree to the rule which will make in order consideration of the bill which the gentleman is asking about. During general debate on that bill I am sure the legislative committee responsible for bringing it to the floor of the House will be glad to answer fully the questions of the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. As I read the bill it says that the President may lend 2 destroyers and 2 destroyer escorts to the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany, 2 submarines to the Government of Greece, 2 destroyer escorts to the Government of Portugal and 2 destroyers to the Government of Spain, for a period of not more than 5 years. Then there is a provision that he can extend that for an additional period of not more than 5 years. I think the gentleman from Iowa is interested in the fact that all expenses involved shall be charged to funds programed for the recipient governments under the Mutual Security Act. I know the gentleman is interested in knowing who provides funds under the Mutual Security Act. I think Iowa contributes quite a share.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I thank the gentleman for the information he has given the House.

I yield back the balance of my time, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The House is adopting resolutions from the Committee on Rules, as I understand it, to make the considertion of these bills in order. When will the bill be called up?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Some of them may be called up this afternoon, the Chair will advise the gentleman.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Well, if they are to be called up this afternoon, let me say this. I already notice there is $2 million on one, $20 million on another, 10 or more vessels loaned for a period of 10 years, I will have to make a point of no quorum if they are called up today. I am trying to establish a record for economy.

Mr. COLMER. Would the gentleman from Michigan withhold that until we could dispose of the rules?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Sure. Mr. Speaker, my only point was that when the bills are taken up, I thought the Members ought to be here. They will have finished their office work and their committee work by that time, I am sure.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands the gentleman from Michigan.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATION ACT AND THE CIVIL FUNCTIONS APPROPRIATION ACT

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 526 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7992) to enact certain provisions now included in the Department of Defense Appropriation Act and the Civil Functions Appropriation Act, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ELLSWORTH], and pending that, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 526 makes in order the consideration of H. R. 7992, the so-called point of order bill. The resolution provides for an open rule and 1 hour of general debate.

The purpose of this bill, as amended, is to enact into permanent law numerous legislative provisions which have heretofore appeared in appropriation acts. Enactment of this bill will supply legislative authorization and will preclude the raising of points of order with respect thereto in the consideration of annual appropriation acts.

The proposed bill, as amended, contains 33 sections, most of which involve relatively minor matters. It also amends in minor respects some existing law authorizing the expenditure of funds for certain purposes and repeals certain statutory authorization heretofore applicable only to the Navy Department, thus providing a uniform authorization for all the military departments for such expenditures.

Section 27 repeals section 638 of the Defense Appropriation Act of 1956, which required the Department of Defense to submit to the Appropriations Committees of the House and Senate for their approval the proposed transfer to private industry of operations performed by civilian personnel of the Department of Defense for 3 or more years and which involved more than 10 employees. The committee adopted an amendment which gives to the Congress the full authority to pass upon each proposed transfer within reasonable limitations.

Section 10 authorizes the training in law at civilian universities of a maximum of 135 officers of the regular components of the Armed Forces within any 3-year period. Existing restrictions in the Defense Appropriation Act of 1956 and the 1957 act precludes such training.

These two sections are the only sections which present any departure from the authorizing language contained in previous appropriation bills.

The committee report complies with the Ramseyer rule, and I urge the adoption of House Resolution 526.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, there is no objection to the passage of this rule on this side. Therefore, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING INTERSTATE COMMERCE ACT TO REGULATE USE BY MOTOR CARRIERS OF MOTOR VEHICLES NOT OWNED BY THEM

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 578 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 898) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, with respect to the authority of the Interstate Commerce Commission to regulate the use by motor carriers (under leases, contracts, or other arrangements) of motor vehicles not owned by them, in the furnishing of transportation of property. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ELLSWORTH], and at this time I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 578 makes in order the consideration of S. 898, which would amend that section of the Interstate Commerce Act having to do with the use by motor carriers of motor vehicles not owned by them. The Resolution provides for an open rule with 1 hour of debate.

Under proposed regulations of the Interstate Commerce Commission, the effective date for which has been postponed from time to time, motor carriers who lease motor vehicles that they do not own, must lease such vehicles for at least 30 days' duration. The Commission has stated that this rule was necessary to maintain effective control over the operational safety, carrier responsibility and the economics of the motor-carrier industry.

The 30-day lease requirement is the provision to which strong objection has been made, for it is contended generally, that it would for all practical purposes abolish "trip-leasing," the term given to the leasing of a motor vehicle, with driver, for a single one-way haul or a round trip. Currently the ICC has granted exemption from the 30-day minimum leasing rules to agricultural haulers. However, it is believed that the exemptions should be provided for by statue so that the ICC could not at a later date cancel such exemptions.

If trip-leasing were abolished, truck haulers of agricultural commodities, livestock, fish, and other perishable products, who now obtain return hauls by leasing their trucks to authorized motor carriers would no longer be able to do so, but would have to return empty. Hence such haulers would have to charge more for hauling those products, thus increasing the cost of marketing and the spread between farm and consumer prices.

S. 898 provides that section 204 of the Interstate Commerce Act be amended so that the 30-day minimum leasing rule would not apply to motor vehicles used in the transportation of agricultural and other perishable commodities.

The committee report complies with the Ramsayer rule.

I urge the adoption of House Resolution 578 so that the House may proceed to the consideration of S. 898.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, there is no objection to the adoption of this rule on this side. Therefore, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARKETING FACILITIES FOR HANDLING PERISHABLE AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 556, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that

the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4054) to encourage the improvement and development of marketing facilities for handling perishable agricultural commodities. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ELLSWORTH], and at this time I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this rule makes in order the bill H. R. 4054. That bill is one that has been before the House several times. In fact, it passed the House once. Substantially, it provides for the guaranty or insurance of loans for the construction of marketing facilities in metropolitan areas. The reason advanced for it is that in many large cities the marketing facilities are very inadeqaute and obsolete. In many cases they are far removed from the railroad. They are in rundown condition. Goods that are shipped in, such as perishables, for consumption in the markets of large cities are so far removed from other means of transportation that it becomes very expensive to take them off the railroad and put them on trucks and carry them to these marketing facilities and unload them there.

There has been no opposition to the bill in the Committee on Rules. It does not provide for the expenditure of any funds but it does provide for the insurance of these marketing facilities to the extent of 85 percent. It is somewhat similar to the various and sundry housing provisions.

I know of no objection to the rule. There will probably be some to the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, the bill this resolution would make in order, H. R. 4054, appears to be one of those measures coming frequently before Congress which would require a considerable amount of discussion and understanding on the floor. Speaking for myself alone, after having heard the testimony given by the committee before the Rules Committee, I find myself having some doubts as to the wisdom of the bill. However, I was glad to vote in the Rules Committee for a rule to bring the bill to the floor. Therefore, I am urging the adoption of this resolution, because this bill, rather more than most of the others we have had under discussion today, deserves full and free debate on the floor.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

PROCEDURE IN THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to the procedure? It is proposed now that the House adjourn?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. We have special orders yet to be heard.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. But no legislation?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. If the gentleman objects, there will be no legislation.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I certainly will make a point of order on some of these bills.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the circumstances, the Chair will proceed with the recognition of Members under special orders.

THE JERSEY FARMER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HAND] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, although New Jersey is widely known as the Garden State, its preeminent position in agriculture is sometimes lost sight of because most people are familiar with its concentrated metropolitan area in which are located thousands of modern factories, which make our small State the sixth greatest industrial producer in the Union.

FIRST IN ACRE CASH

The interesting fact remains that my State continues to rank No. 1 in cash receipts per acre, which has now reached the phenomenal figure of $195 per acre of agricultural land. Curiously, the next highest producers per acre are the like industrial northeastern States of Connecticut, Rhode Island, Delaware, and Massachusetts. The justly famous States of our Farm Belt in the Middle West are not even close competitors on a cash acreage basis.

What is perhaps even more unusual, New Jersey is fourth ranking State in cash receipts per farm. Although our average farm is only 70 acres in size, our cash receipts per farm are $13,542. We are only significantly exceeded by the State of California with an average acreage of 250, and the leader, Arizona, but the average farm acreage there is 4,000 acres compared to our 70.

New Jersey, the third smallest State in the Union in geographical area, produced more than $366 million of agricultural products in the year 1955.

Our leading farm products are eggs, milk, vegetables, and poultry, but by far the greatest crop is eggs, of which we produce $121 million worth, a very substantial part of which is produced in my congressional district.

WE ARE FARMERS, TOO

All of this is by way of preface to indicate that this great agricultural producer is seriously neglected in our national legislation, which is concentrated for the benefit of the West and South. The first farm bill, which happily the President vetoed, would have adversely affected our leading crops of eggs, poultry, and milk, and was of no help whatever to vegetables. The second bill, while less harmful to a degree, still has the net effect of damaging agriculture in New Jersey. The concentration on artificially maintaining prices for grain crops simply causes the egg industry, for example, to pay more for what it needs than it would have to pay in a free market, while at the same time the price of eggs is not supported. The soil-bank plan which is, no doubt, of benefit to agriculture elsewhere, has an insignificant effect in New Jersey, except for some of our corn producers.

Nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, the average New Jersey farmer is going to work out his own salvation as best he can, but he hopes that some time in the future, the national farm policy will not be completely concentrated on wheat, corn, cotton, and tobacco—the so-called basic crops—which even include tung nuts and honey. It is hard for them to appreciate that tung nuts are basic to the national welfare while eggs are not.

THE APPROPRIATION BILL

This years' appropriation bill for the Department of Agriculture, however, is of interest and benefit to New Jersey as well as to the rest of the Nation. Our farmers are pleased with the committee report on soil conservation, which is as follows:

SOIL CONSERVATION

The committee has resisted efforts for the past 3 years to curtail the soil-conservation programs of the Department. Each year it has restored budget cuts in these activities.

In this bill, the committee has exceeded the budget for the Soil Conservation Service by $5 million, to assure adequate technical assistance to an increasing number of soil-conservation districts, and to accelerate the watershed protection and flood-prevention programs of the Department. Further, it has again included $250 million in the bill for the advance agricultural conservation program announcement for next year.

This action appears to be particularly appropriate in view of the need for increased attention to diverted acres and soil reserves. It is entirely consistent with the actions of the Congress and the administration in adopting the soil-bank plan, which had its genesis with certain members of this committee in January 1954. The organizations now operating the soil-conservation programs of the Department should be given adequate financial support in this bill to carry out any new programs of this type which might be undertaken. The committee feels that the amounts it has recommended for the next fiscal year will help these agencies to meet this additional responsibility.

The Soil Conservation Service assists soil conservation districts and other cooperators in bringing about physical adjustments in land use that will conserve soil and water resources, provide economic production on a sustained basis, and reduce damages from floods and sedimentation. The Service also develops and carries out special drainage, irrigation, flood prevention, and watershed protection programs in cooperation with soil conservation districts, watershed groups, and other Federal and State agencies having related responsibility. It is expected that the new soil-bank legislation will increase the work of this agency in these fields.

Conservation operations: The committee recommends an appropriation of $67,500,000 for 1957, an increase of $4,557,255 over the 1956 appropriation and an increase of $2,285,000 in the budget estimate.

ANIMAL DISEASE

We are likewise glad to see $22 million appropriated for plant and animal diseases and pest control, and over $2 million to control the gypsy moth, which is potentially a serious threat to our agriculture.

For fiscal year 1957, the sum of $3,500,000 was recommended for continuing the study of diseases of animals and poultry, a substantial increase over the amount allowed in 1956. The proposal to construct an animal and poultry laboratory at a cost of some $10 million is encouraging.

PRICE SPREAD

Two problems stand out in my mind, which are not receiving the attention they deserve. One is the very large spread between what the farmer receives for his product and what the consumer pays for such products. Last year, and again this year, the Congress has appropriated funds for a study of this question, which study is continuing in the Department of Agriculture. This spread is serious economically and also psychologically. By the time food gets from the farm to the ultimate consumer, having passed through wholesalers, brokers, retailers, delivery people, and usually very fancy packaging, the price the consumer pays bears no relationship to the original price of the product, which means first, that the farmer is not getting anywhere near his fair share of the cost of food, and which also means that the consumer tends to blame high food prices on the farmer, when in fact the blame belongs elsewhere.

CROP INSURANCE

The second problem is crop insurance. As to this, the committee says in part:

The Federal Crop Insurance Corporation is a wholly owned Government corporation created in 1938. Crop insurance offered to agricultural producers by the Corporation provides protection from losses caused by unavoidable natural hazards, such as insect and wildlife damage, plant diseases, fire, drought, flood, wind, and other weather conditions. It does not indemnify producers for losses resulting from negligence or failure to observe good farming practices.

In the light of recent experience in certain areas of the country, the committee believes that the crop-insurance program should be tried on an experimental basis on peaches and other fruit crops. The committee directs that within the funds provided in the bill for 1957 such an experimental program be initiated.

However, the amount appropriated for this activity is $6,210,000 which indicates, obviously, that this insurance program is on an extremely limited basis.

Just as I favor Federal participation in insurance programs indemnifying our coastal and other areas against the devastating effect of hurricanes and storms, so I favor the extension of crop insurance on a premium basis to protect the farmer against natural hazards, which he cannot prevent and which are sometimes catastrophic. The problems to an extent are intermingled. In our last severe hurricane, for example, the publicity mostly dealt with coastal areas, but enormous damage was done to the fruit orchards and the poultry houses in the inland sections of my district.

Broadly speaking, Mr. Speaker, at least these things are needed, amongst others, for New Jersey agriculture:

First. Less concentration on the so-called basic crops, and more attention to the vital food stuffs which are grown in the Northeast;

Second. Less spread between the price the farmer gets and what the consumer pays; and

Third. A greatly improved and expanded crop-insurance program.

THE MANIFESTO AND THE SUPREME COURT

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, these are trying times in this great country of ours. We see on every hand agencies and arms of the Federal Government reaching out their octopuslike tentacles grasping and taking from the people rights and privileges that were delegated to our people by the Founding Fathers of this great country of ours in the Constitution. We see an arrogant Supreme Court attempting to change the habits, customs, traditions, and mores of our people. This Court has arrogated unto itself powers never given it by the Constitution in an attempt by judicial decree to compel the people of this country to accept the sociological and political philosophy of the individual members of the Court. This Court has usurped authority and is attempting to wreck the sovereignty of our individual States.

The fateful and horrible decision rendered by the Supreme Court of the United States of America on May 17, 1954, declaring segregation in the public schools of America unconstitutional is just one of the many decisions by the Court attempting to change our way of life.

The problem created by this illegal and unfounded decision based on the political philosophy and theory of the Supreme Court Justices has done more to disrupt and damage race relations in the South than we realized at the time of the decision. It is heartening, however, to see that gradually there is an awakening on the part of a large part of the American people, particularly the editors, to the awareness of our problem in the South and the necessity for combating, overriding and changing the dreadful decision referred to heretofore. It was not based on law and legal precedent.

The people of this country are fortunate indeed to have at this time as a Member of the House of Representatives from the great State of Georgia, the Honorable E. L. FORRESTER. Representative FORRESTER is one of the most able Members of the Congress. He is an outstanding attorney of national repute, a man of high integrity and entirely fearless. I am proud to call him my friend and count it a privilege to serve in the House of Representatives with him. Representative FORRESTER has written an article explaining in detail the manifesto submitted by 101 Members of the Congress expressing their views on the Supreme Court decision referred to hereinbefore.

In an endeavor to acquaint the people of this country with what is happening to them as a result of the recent decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States, I include with my remarks the article by Representative E. L. FORRESTER entitled "The Manifesto and the Supreme Court," which appeared in the July 1956 issue of Facts Forum, which is as follows:

THE MANIFESTO AND THE SUPREME COURT

(By Representative E. L. FORRESTER, Democrat, of Georgia)

On March 12, 1956, there was submitted to the Senate and the House of Representatives a declaration of constitutional principles signed by 19 Senators and 82 Representatives, which is now commonly referred to as "The Southern Manifesto." The word "manifesto" is perhaps not fully understood by everyone, and consequently some confusion has arisen as to its meaning. However, the word "manifesto" simply means a group declaration of principles.

That so-called manifesto was a declaration of our constitutional rights. I sincerely wish that every citizen had a copy of it. It is an immortal document, and as sure as the sun shines it will take its place as one of the greatest classics, and future generations from all sections of this country will be glad that someone spoke out for their fundamental and constitutional rights. I did not have the privilege of assisting in the preparation of that instrument, but I did have the privilege of signing my name thereto, and thereby telling posterity that I endorsed every word in it. That declaration was by Senators and Representatives from the section of our country that, more than any other section, wrote and gave us our Constitution.

Thomas Jefferson, George Mason, George Washington and the other framers of that Constitution suffered at the hands of a Government possessing centralized and complete power. Those men understood the tyranny that naturally and always follows all-inclusive power. The present generation, the beneficiaries of the work of those great men, has not had the experiences concerning the intoxicating qualities of unlimited power in the hands of human agents entrusted therewith. They have not personally experienced the fact that history indisputably proves, that human beings have always become tyrannical when all power is placed in their hands.

Framers of the Constitution labored for months; they strove to form a Union, giving that Union only the necessary powers to operate successfully, reserving to the States and our people all the rights not delegated to the Federal Government. Fear of tyranny, fear of unlimited power and fear of the loss of liberty were the influences operating in the minds of those great men. Those men were determined to preserve the rights won by patriots who risked conviction for treason to obtain those rights. Everyone should see that original document, and take note of the fact that they diligently sought to use the right words. The deletions, erasures, and substitutions of language completely illustrate that they intended our Constitution to be the judicial skeleton of our laws and the foundation of our Government.

They did not intend for these foundations to be wiped out because of clamor, hysteria, treaty law, or by judicial decree. On the other hand, they did anticipate that the future and changed conditions might make some changes and additions necessary.

They intentionally provided in our Constitution the machinery therefor. They did not intend to make these changes or additions impossible, but they certainly did not intend to make these changes or additions so easy that they could be accomplished without the knowledge of the people, and without the people having the opportunity to reflect thereon and to work their will. Inasmuch as our Constitution has been amended 22 times, the argument of some that amending imposes impossible requirements falls to the ground. Likewise, the position that our Supreme Court has taken to the effect that our Constitution must be interpreted in the light of the times or on changed conditions or that the Court has learned more about sociology since our Constitution and amendments thereto were adopted, becomes a usurpation of power which belongs—and, despite any United States Supreme Court decision, will always belong—to the people.

Decisions usurping these powers can be found in the words of Justice Frankfurter in *Wolf* v. *Colorado* (338 U. S. 2527), and in the article of Justice Douglas on stare decisis, and in *U. S.* v. *Classic* (313 U. S. 316, 319) and in the five cases known as the school cases, decided in May 1954 and reported in Three Hundred Forty-seventh United States Reports. Regarding the school cases referred to, the Supreme Court said, in approaching the questions presented to the Court: "In approaching this problem we cannot turn the clock back to 1868 when the amendment was adopted, or even to 1896 when *Plessy* v. *Ferguson* was written. We must consider public education in the light of its full development and its present place in American life throughout the Nation. Only in this way can it be determined if segregation in public schools deprives these plaintiffs of the equal protection of the law." What that court was actually saying was that it would not construe the 14th amendment, the basis of these decisions, according to the intentions of the lawmakers when that amendment was adopted in the Congress and that they would not construe the questions according to the intentions of the people who ratified that amendment. They were, in effect, saying that we will interpret the Constitution as it appears to us to be in harmony with our belief today, and if our beliefs change tomorrow, or a few days from now, we will again interpret that constitutional amendment as we wish it to be. In other words, we will make the Constitution a chameleon, changing its color according to our moods and fancies, and as we please.

I wonder what the architects of our Constitution would think. I ask the American people, what would Mr. Jefferson, Mr. Mason, President Washington and those other great men have said if some dreamer should have said to them while they were laboring over the creation of this instrument, "You need not be so careful in selecting the proper language for this instrument, for it will mean one thing today and another thing tomorrow." Everyone knows that under that hypothesis there would have been no Constitution.

If our Supreme Court has the right to change the meaning of our organic law whenever it sees fit, or to deviate in the slightest from the meaning and intent of our people who ratified that document then actually we have never had a Constitution. Further, it also means that what we understood were the bulwarks of our way of life have become an ambush to law-abiding citizens who planned their businesses upon the decisions of that Court yesterday. It is surprising and doubtless shocking, but the Supreme Court of the United States has declared that there is no restraint placed upon it that is not self-imposed. Under these declarations just quoted the Supreme Court is endowed with the powers of a dictatorship. Irrespective of what the Supreme Court says, there are restraints placed upon it. The framers of our Constitution saw to it that there were checks and balances. The Constitution itself is a restraint. Further, our Constitution provides that the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court on all constitutional questions shall be subject to such exceptions and regulations as Congress might make.

RESTRAINTS KNOWN

Restraints upon the Supreme Court are well known to many who would like to remove those restraints. S. 44, introduced in the 83d Congress, completely proves that these restraints were known to be in existence. S. 44 provided that the Supreme Court would have appellate jurisdiction on all constitutional questions, leaving out the present constitutional provision that Congress would have the right to make exceptions and regulations. Had S. 44 passed and been adopted, the Congress of the United States would have surrendered the power to make exceptions and regulations, and would have deprived the people from upsetting any of the erroneous decisions (and there are many) rendered by the United States Supreme Court, and no agency of the Government would have any power whatever save the Supreme Court, and the Supreme Court would have been completely free to interpret the Constitution belonging to 165 million Americans, without any lawful restraint. I will always be humbly grateful for the privilege that was mine to lead the fight in the House Committee on Judiciary and kill S. 44. I feel certain that the rank and file of our people do not know that there was ever a bill like S. 44, which by its terms would have deprived the people of any power whatsoever regarding the Supreme Court.

Some have said the southern Senators and Representatives had no right to issue that declaration of principles concerning the Supreme Court. Some have said that we took an oath to support the Supreme Court. I am astonished over such statements. We never took an oath to support the Supreme Court. We did take an oath to support the Constitution of the United States, and that oath carries with it the duty to criticize any branch of this Government that has violated the Constitution. That oath also carries the duty to do everything possible to preserve the Constitution. The arguments are ridiculous. Our history abounds in criticisms toward the Supreme Court.

President Jackson criticized the Supreme Court severely. Indeed, one of the contributing causes of the War Between the States was the refusal to accept the Supreme Court decision in the Dred Scott case. See Beveridge's Abraham Lincoln, volume IV, pages 157–158, stating that in 1858 the Republican leaders in the Senate accused the Supreme Court of being engaged in a scheme to spread slavery over the country. According to that book, the Republican Party joined that criticism in unity. Page 157 of that volume says that Senator Trumbull described the Dred Scott decision as the "odious and infamous opinion of a slave-driving Court," and that Court must be "wholly and totally revolutionized." See Nicolay and Hay, Lincoln Works, volume I, page 229, where Mr. Lincoln chided Judge Douglas for saying that no criticism or resistance should be made against a Supreme Court decision. Mr. Lincoln reminded Judge Douglas that he had applauded criticisms of that Court in the past and remarked, "It would be interesting for him to look over his recent speech and see how exactly his fierce philippics against us for resisting Supreme Court decisions fall upon his own head." Everyone remembers the harsh and continued criticisms of the Supreme Court by President Franklin Roosevelt. President Roosevelt referred to that Court as nine old and tired men, and endeavored to get rid of those Justices in every conceivable way. If we have lost the right to criticize the Supreme Court, Congress, or the President of the United States, then one of our greatest protections of constitutional government has been lost.

It was the combination of the school cases decisions and many other decisions that inspired a declaration of principles. For the last 20 years the Court has shown little respect for the rule of stare decisis, although that rule is hoary with age and indispensable as a rule of law. Stare decisis simply means "to stand by decided cases; to uphold precedent; to maintain former adjudications." The doctrine rests upon the sound principle that law by which men are governed should be fixed, definite, and known, and that when the law is declared by a court authorized to do so, such declarations, in the absence of palpable error, be accepted by the public as the law until changed by the legislative branch of the Government. The Supreme Court has made many decisions holding that stare decisis is peculiarly applicable to constitutional questions, but unfortunately it has also many times ruled that stare decisis is not applicable to constitutional questions. I think the public will agree that the rule of stare decisis should apply with more force to constitutional questions than perhaps any other legal question.

PRESIDENT MADE AGREEMENT

Another case that we do not like is *U. S.* v. *Pink* (315 U. S. 203). In that case moneys in a bank in New York were taken charge of by the courts of New York and that court was proceeding by well-settled law to administer those assets in a legal way. The President of the United States made an agreement with Soviet Representative Litvinov regarding those moneys, and though this agreement was made only by the President and was never submitted to the Senate for approval, the Supreme Court held that the President's agreement, like a treaty, superseded our Constitution and the laws of New York, thus saying that with one stroke of a pen the President could annihilate our Constitution and State laws.

In the case of *Missouri* v. *Holland* (252 U. S. 416), the Supreme Court held that a treaty made with Great Britain made a law which had therefore been held unconstitutional completely valid, by ruling that this treaty was superior to our Constitution. Those rulings are not law, and have never been the law, and we reserve the right to criticize them. Thomas Jefferson said: "If the treaty power is unlimited, we have no Constitution." As a result of such decisions, the report of President Truman's Committee on Civil Rights in 1947 proudly pointed out that while our Constitution did not convey delegated powers to protect civil rights, that this could be overridden by means of treaties, and that the doctrine regarding treaty law had obvious importance in the field of civil rights legislation. That report said further that the Human Rights Commission of the United Nations was working on an international bill of rights, and if that was accepted by the United States, a strong basis for congressional action under the treaty power may be established. It is amazing to realize that for 120 golden years our Supreme Court held that our Constitution was supreme and that a treaty could not override its provisions; see *New Orleans* v. *United States* (10 Pet. 662, decided in 1838).

In *Shelly* v. *Kramer* (334 U. S. 1), the United States Supreme Court held that restrictive racial covenants in deeds were unenforceable, although for many years there was an unbroken background upholding racial covenants. It is true, of course, that these usually provided that the property conveyed would never be deeded to one of African descent. It necessarily follows, however, that any persons of African descent

had the same right to incorporate in their deeds that the land could never be conveyed to any other race.

SUBMERGED LANDS WERE PROPERTY OF STATES

The result of the decision destroying these racial covenants was to cause damage to the property owners in this country exceeding the expense of some of our wars. It is a well-known fact that property in a neighborhood inhabited by mixed races immediately and seriously declines in value. The people suffering those terrific damages had relied upon the Court's former decisions that such covenants were valid and enforceable. When the United States Constitution was adopted, the States brought into that union their lands and their seacoasts, and throughout the ages it had been recognized that while the Government had a highway over the seas, the submerged lands were the property of the States. The Supreme Court a short time ago upset that ruling, and held that the United States owned those submerged lands. It took an act of Congress to destroy that erroneous decision. If those lands belonged to the Government, then the fish, shrimp, and all marine life belonged to the Government, and our citizens had been taking marine life from the sea unlawfully. Businesses built upon land that was a part of the sea would have automatically become the property of the Government.

Certainly the decisions regarding the five school cases aroused the interest of the Senators and Representatives signing the manifesto. It would have been news to Charles Sumner and Thaddeus Stevens, the two most rabid on civil rights, when the civil rights laws and the 14th amendment were passed, that their bills touched public schools. Both confessed many times that their legislation did not. In the middle of the debate of the 14th amendment Congress paused to pass a bill conveying property in the District of Columbia for the sole use of colored children (14 Stat. 342 (1866)). Segregated schools were established in the District of Columbia in 1862 when the War Between the States was raging, and segregated schools continued in the District until after the decision of the Supreme Court in 1954. Everyone knows that the District of Columbia, the seat of our Government, is and has been the guinea pig for all social experiments.

Stevens and Sumner knew schools were segregated in the District, and would have stopped them if they had had any legal basis therefor. In 1871 Senator Sumner tried to pass a law outlawing school segregation in the District of Columbia, but he was unable to do so. See S. 1244, 41st Congress, 3d session., CONGRESSIONAL GLOBE, 41st Congress, 3d session, 1053–1061. In December 1875 President Grant recommended to Congress a constitutional amendment to require all States to maintain schools for all children, irrespective of color. That recommendation was not followed by Congress. Had not segregated schools been the law in the District of Columbia and the majority of the States in the Union, there would have been no necessity for creating Howard University in the District of Columbia for the purpose of educating colored children at the expense of the taxpayers. Certainly if the intention had been to integrate the races, there could have been no justification for such a school. When the 14th amendment was ratified, there were 37 States in the Union. Twenty-three of those States had segregated schools, while some of the States had no public schools at all. There will be found no mention of education or schools in the 14th amendment or civil rights legislation, or in the Constitution of the United States. Public schools were and continue to be specifically reserved to the States by the 10th amendment.

SENATOR QUOTED

Even Senator Trumbull is quoted in CONGRESSIONAL GLOBE, 42d Congress, 2d session (1872) 3189, as saying: "The right to go to school is not a civil right and never was." In construing the former Supreme Court decisions regarding the 14th amendment and the civil-rights statutes, one must remember that the 14th amendment did provide for voting rights, sitting on juries, and other rights, implemented by civil-rights legislation. Any rights covered by the 14th amendment or implementing statutes come within the purview of the Supreme Court's jurisdiction. Any rights not covered in that amendment or implementing civil-rights statutes are not questions for the Supreme Court to consider. In 1896 the Supreme Court decided the case of *Plessy* v. *Ferguson* (163 U. S., p. 537), involving transportation facilities, a field coming within the 14th amendment and implementing legislation. That Court held that separate but equal facilities satisfied the Constitution. It is true that Justice Harlan, a relative of the present Justice Harlan, dissented in that case. Nevertheless, many State courts, including New York, Ohio, Indiana, and California had theretofore ruled that separate but equal facilities were sufficient.

The ruling in *Plessy* v. *Ferguson* was to the effect that the 14th amendment and the implementing civil-rights legislation were compiled with, though the facilities be separate, if equal. Justice Harlan's dissent in this case was never intended as a dissent on the question of schools. In *Cummings* v. *Board of Education* (175 U. S. 528 (1899)), Justice Harlan wrote the opinion. That was a case involving schools, and in that case he said that separate but equal facilities satisfied every constitutional provision and law, and the Court unanimously agreed with him. The reasoning of Justice Harlan is plain: In the Plessy case he felt that the Constitution and implementing legislation covering transportation was very different from school questions because schools were not touched by the Constitution or by legislation. A great distinction, to be sure. *Gong Lum* v. *Rice* (275 U. S. 78 (1927)), was written by Chief Justice Taft for a unanimous Court, and page 86 shows the holding to the effect that the question presented was one "within the constitutional power of the State legislature to settle without any intervention of the Federal courts under the Federal Constitution."

In that case, Lum, a Chinese, demanded that he be allowed to attend a white school rather than a colored school. The Court said that if the facilities were equal, the Consitution was satisfied. The 1954 decisions of the Supreme Court in the five school cases were virtually sterile with regard to precedents. That Court did refer to the slaughterhouse cases (1873) and *Strauder* v. *West Virginia* (1879). Any lawyer can certainly understand that those cases involved questions specifically covered under the 14th amendment and enabling legislation, and therefore could never be authority on a question completely divorced from the 14th amendment and implementing legislation.

PSYCHOLOGY HAS PLACE

The other cases cited as authority were decided in complete harmony with the separate but equal doctrine. It is shocking that in the 1954 school-case decisions the Supreme Court held that psychological knowledge at the time of the *Plessy* v. *Ferguson* case might not have been as great as modern authority. Psychology has its place, but psychology can never substitute for law. We respectfully maintain that the separate but equal doctrine is the only doctrine that makes good sense. Under these recent decisions one would assume that a male student would be within his constitutional rights to insist that he be enrolled in a school exclusively for females, and be permitted to share their dormitories, based on the contention that this all-girls' school had a better faculty than the male or coeducational school he was attending, and he was thereby deprived of his constitutional rights.

The Senators and Representatives signing the southern manifesto felt, and we believe many all over the United States are beginning to feel, that every vestige of States rights is being rapidly swept away, that our public schools have been the flowers of our democracy because they have been locally controlled. It is shocking to know that in the case of *The Board of Education* v. *Barnette* (319 U. S. 624), the Supreme Court struck down as unlawful a State requirement that schoolchildren salute the American flag. It is our opinion that the local authorities making that requirement were clearly within their rights and that the Court decision was completely erroneous. It is amazing that a State furnishing education to children cannot at the same time ask a little loyalty to the flag that made that privilege possible.

STATE COULD NOT LEGISLATE

We have a right to be discouraged concerning the rights of the States. On April 2, 1956, in the case of *Pennsylvania* v. *Nelson*, the Supreme Court by a split decision held that the State of Pennsylvania could not legislate against sedition, and upset a conviction by a court of Pennsylvania of an acknowledged member of the Communist Party for a violation of the Pennsylvania Sedition Act. That reversal was predicated on the ground that where the Government has legislated on that subject and occupied that field, any State law on that subject is superseded. That decision points out that 42 States, plus Alaska and Hawaii, have statutes prohibiting advocacy of the violent overthrow of our Government. Apparently, that decision has wiped out the laws of those 42 States and Alaska and Hawaii. The Federal law which the Supreme Court held was exclusive and prohibited State action is the law known as the Smith Act (title 18, U. S. C.). No one was more startled over the decision of the Supreme Court than was Congressman SMITH of Virginia, the author of that law.

That decision was rendered despite the fact that section 3231 of title 18 of the United States Code provides: "Nothing in this title shall be held to take away or impair the jurisdiction of the courts of the several States under the laws thereof." Pennsylvania is one of the great States of our Union, and it follows that any attempt to overthrow the Government of the United States is also an attempt to overthrow the government of Pennsylvania and the government of every other State in this Union.

Pending before the House Committee on the Judiciary now is H. R. 3, the same Congressman SMITH being the author thereof, and it simply provides that no act of Congress shall be construed to exclude State laws on the same subject, unless the act contains an express provision to that effect. By all means the people of this country should rise up and insist that H. R. 3 be speedily enacted. It is not expedient to try to pass a law to remedy only one Supreme Court decision. H. R. 3 would cover all congressional laws not containing the provision that State laws are excluded. On April 9, 1956, the Supreme Court in the case of *Slochowera* v. *Board of Higher Education of the city of New York*, ruled in a split decision that said school board could not discharge Slochowera as a schoolteacher because, when he was testifying before the Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security, he refused to answer questions concerning his membership in the Communist Party during the years 1940 and 1941 on the ground that his answers might tend to incriminate him. The board of education acted under section 903 of its city charter, providing that an employee of the city claiming the privilege against self-incrimination to avoid answering a question relating to his official conduct would have his employment terminated. The majority

opinion of the Supreme Court says that no sinister meaning can be imputed toward a person asserting his rights under the fifth amendment. We do not agree with that statement.

FIFTH AMENDMENT PROTECTS

The fifth amendment does say that no person shall be compelled to give evidence against himself, and protects the individual from being convicted on such compelled testimony. It certainly does not mean that a person exercising that privilege can insist that he continue in the most sensitive area of our country, the schoolroom, and that the city is helpless to discharge him. Perhaps the public does not know that the same section 903 has been invoked many times against policemen in the city of New York, and that policemen claiming the fifth amendment have been discharged.

So long as the States are permitted to legislate and to exercise their rights retained in the 10th amendment, we have no fear for our country. We will stake our destiny upon our faith in the majority of the States of our Union. But when our States are not permitted to legislate on subjects covered by the Federal laws, then we see grave danger to our way of life. One United States Attorney General, entrusted with the destiny of our entire Union and our liberties, by reason of the fact that he alone is charged with enforcement of those laws, by his failure to act, his lack of sympathy with our ideals or even his lack of ability, could bring disaster upon our heads. Without reflection upon any Attorney General, past or present, a disloyal one could wreck our cherished institutions and destroy our liberties. Anyone familiar with Communist activities knows that their strategy is to infiltrate our most important Government agencies and our finest private institutions.

The signers of the declaration of principles have no apologies for their criticism. We support the Constitution of the United States. We recognize the powers belonging to the States and to the citizens of our Union. We have never asked the Supreme Court to "turn back the clock." We simply ask them to keep their hands off the clock and not attempt to keep time for America, that being the inalienable right of our 165 million American citizens. We know that good people all over our land share our views. No section has a monopoly on patriotism or loyalty. The American people are waking up. We do not wish to divide our people. We know that we are facing the most relentless enemy of human history. We want and expect to win this battle, both within and without our gates. America will stand up and be counted.

AIRPORT AT BURKE, VA.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, for the fifth time this year I rise to ask my friends on the other side of the aisle to follow President Eisenhower in suggested legislation. Since 1950 I have been appealing to the Appropriations Committee, and the subcommittee on which I sit dealing with CAA. I have offered a series of amendments in the Subcommitee on the Department of Commerce and in the full Committee on Appropriations and on the floor on main appropriation bills and on supplemental bills asking for funds to commence the construction of a new national airport at Burke, Va. The House and the committee have seen fit to reject those requests.

In 1950 we succeeded in getting the first million dollars to purchase the necessary land to begin the construction of this new airport.

In last night's Evening Star, Mr. Speaker, I saw a headline, "President Presses for the Burke Airport." Mr. Speaker, I hope this House and the Appropriations Committee in this body and the other body will give immediate consideration and attention to this essential and necessary addition to the safety of our Federal airways.

PROCEDURE IN THE HOUSE

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Theer was no objection.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I take this minute to make some comment about the way we operate here in the House. Today we are finding it difficult to stretch out the business to remain in session for an hour, and of course no controversial issues will be considered.

Last Friday we had under consideration a bill to raise postal rates. Toward the end of the day a motion was made that all debate on the bill end in 15 minutes, and at that time vote on the bill, although there were some 6 amendments pending. In the division of the time, I was allotted 2 minutes to discuss what I thought was a rather important amendment.

Although the amendment on the first standing vote was defeated by a vote of 110 to 104, it was later defeated by a much larger vote. But, the next morning it was interesting—I had at least 25 Members who came to me and said that they had voted against the amendment because they did not understand it. I thought I had explained the amendment rather fully in the 2 minutes allotted to me. But, I want to say for the benefit of those who have expressed themselves in favor of an amendment which would restrict the activities of Members in sending franked matter, reprints from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, that they might have an opportunity to vote for that legislation later. I had already introduced a bill which has been referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and those Members who are sincerely interested in practicing some economy can express themselves as being in favor of that bill which I hope the committee will report out.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

KEEP THE COURT SUPREME

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, during the past many weeks the Supreme Court of the United States, the third coordinate branch of our Federal Government, has been under a merciless attack by persons who oppose its decisions, primarily the decision of the Court banning segregation in the Nation's public schools. The history of our Nation is replete with attacks against the High Court for its courageous stands on momentous issues. The Court has equally been criticized from time to time for its failure to show adequate courage in the face of dynamic, sociological change. There has in fact been no time in history when the decisions of the Court were pleasing to every American. In fact there is no time that the decision of any court is pleasing to more than 50 percent of the interested parties in any litigation.

It is an inherent right of any American to critically evaluate the work of any public official, elected, or appointed, who serves our Nation in either of the three branches of the Federal Government. That is the essence of our democratic system and the Justices of the Supreme Court must face fair criticism in the same manner as any Member of Congress or any executive in the administration. However, such criticism must be temperate and impersonal, directed toward the decision or to the action rather than to the person.

The vehemence of the current prolonged attack on the Supreme Court of the United States gradually destroys the concept that the individual has for the administration of justice and respect for the law. The undermining of public confidence in the supreme legal authority of the United States Supreme Court undermines public confidence in all courts and impairs the law and order of the land.

It is argued that the recent integration decision is without legal merit and that it is contrary to the separate but equal decisions in previous cases. The separate and equal doctrine was an evolutionary step in the development of civil-rights law and in effect a moderate approach to the integration which is spelled out clearly in the American Constitution. If the Supreme Court deserves criticism on its integration decision, that criticism must be directed to the delay and the long road which the Court followed to finally reach its conclusion on the doctrine of segregated schools.

Recently a proposal was made to prohibit appointment to the Supreme Court without at least 5 years' experience in a lower court. Judicial experience is invaluable on the bench, but a lifetime of experience cannot provide sound judgment and sound reasoning where it did not originally exist. I suggest that this proposal is a blatant attempt to discredit a majority of the Justices, including the Chief Justice, who presently sit on that revered bench out of a deep and dedicated sense of duty. Their trust is unparalleled in the world. The proposal would have disqualified and denied to America the talents and genius of some of the most illustrious men in our history. John Marshall, who picked the Court up by the bootstraps and made it

an important member of our executive-legislative-judicial triangle of checks and balances did not have 5 years' experience on the bench before his appointment. Nor did Roger Taney, who gave the Dred Scott decision on slaveholding a century ago; nor Salmon Chase, who had been in Lincoln's Cabinet; nor Melville Fuller, who was Chief Justice in 1896, when the Plessy against Ferguson case set up the separate but equal basis for segregation; nor Charles Evans Hughes.

It seems to me that the attacks which are being made upon the Supreme Court are designed as a retaliatory attempt to place in a position of public distrust an entire Court of fine and distinguished gentlemen for their rendition of a verdict which some persons find distasteful. It is nowhere provided in the Constitution that a decision must be pleasing to all sections of the country. Any group of people interposing against a decision which they do not like and declaring that it shall not be applicable are close to the brink of anarchy if their interposition is a belief that they can nullify the effect of a general decision upon their community.

The undisputable fact is that our Supreme Court has grown to keep pace with the increasing strength of our national Union. The courage of the Court has grown as the courage of the Nation has grown in the belief that this is a nation joined in the love of liberty and in the respect for equality under the law.

The Supreme Court's decision banning segregation in the Nation's public schools is the first long-overdue step in providing what the Constitution originally intended should be the law. The long road ahead calls for prompt legislative action to bring about a full measure of civil rights for every citizen. The current vicious attacks upon the integrity of the Supreme Court of the United States are, indeed, intemperate and not in the interest of the national well-being.

POSTAL RATE BILL

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, during the debate on the postal rate bill the other day, I made some arguments, which I thought were based on facts and which I still think were based on facts, with regard to assigning the deficit from the second- and third-class departments of the Post Office over to the first-class mail department users of the 3-cent stamp and 6-cent airmail stamp. The time was very limited and we had to avail ourselves of such time as the parliamentary procedure allowed us. Shortly after my remarks on the floor, in which I paid strict attention to the merits of the legislation and made no allusions to individual Members of the House, three Members of the minority party who are members of our committee—and I will not use their names because I did not know that I would have the time at this time to address the House and, therefore, had no opportunity to notify them—these three Members arose and in place of replying to my arguments on the postal rate bill, they proceeded to take me to task personally and intimated that I had not performed my committee duties as ardently as I should have.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. You realize very well, I am sure, that no one is subject to attack that way unless he has been doing a worthwhile job.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. I will say this. I happen to be a member of 3 committees of the House—2 by choice and 1 by assignment of the leadership. The reason I was assigned to the Post Office and Civil Service Committee was that due to the fairly equal division of Members in the House, it was found that on the Democratic side I was the only Member not either serving on an exclusive committee or who was not already serving on two different committees. It so happens the House Committee on Government Operations is not an exclusive committee, and it also so happens that the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy is not counted as a House committee. My duties on both of those committees are very heavy. I am chairman of the legislative authorization committee of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, and I have very heavy duties with reference to all atomic-energy legislation pertaining to those subjects which go through my subcommittee. I am also chairman of the subcommittee on military operations of the Committee on Government Operations.

We have been holding hearings for some 5 months. We have been in session many mornings and afternoons. We have accumulated, I think, the most complete treatment of Federal civil defense that has yet been made by a committee of either body.

So my duties on those committees have prevented me from attending all of the meetings of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. However, I have tried to attend every meeting that I could. Particularly, I have tried to be there when legislation was voted out. So I do not think it was a courteous or kindly act on the part of my colleagues on that committee to make a disparaging remark about the discharge of my committee duties. I feel that I have probably put in as many hours in committee as any Member of the Congress, serving as I do on three committees.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I am glad to yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Is it not a fact that if you do attend to your duties on either one of the committees to which you have made reference you just cannot be here on the floor when much of this legislation is considered?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. That is certainly true. You cannot be in another committee that is meeting at the same time. Particularly if you are chairman of a subcommittee. You have to preside as chairman of that subcommittee, and you cannot desert your own subcommittee in order to go to another committee of which you may be a member.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Well, does it not follow that unless the matter which is being heard by the committee has to do with legislation which is about to come before the House, we should not be holding committee hearings during these last 2 or 3 weeks of the session?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I will say this much, that the judgment of the chairman of a subcommittee must prevail in a case like this. In my own case, I have tried to arrange my subcommittee schedules so that I will not have meetings during the last 2 or 3 weeks of the Congress. But I was forced to hold hearings on the Atomic Energy Committee while the House was in session. As I say, that is a privilege of the chairman of a subcommittee.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

MUTUAL SECURITY APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, in view of today's abbreviated session, indicating that there is no serious business pressing upon the House and probably will not be until the end of the session, I think we have every reason to expect that tomorrow, when the multi-million-dollar WPA bill is before the House, there will be no unreasonable limitation of debate.

STATEMENTS BY THE PRESS

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that one of our subcommittee chairmen, the gentleman from California [Mr. Moss] is on the floor, I would like to ask permission to address the House for 5 minutes at this time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the reference was made to the gentleman from California [Mr. Moss], because yesterday in the committee a question which I consider of considerable importance came up. Because there might be some misunderstanding about the question which was raised, and that statement is made because of press comment, this time is taken. The point yesterday was this: Reference was made by the committee counsel to a newspaper article, parts of which were put in the record. My objection at that time was that if in committee hearings statements from the press were to be read and incorporated in the record, as evidence, whenever those statements charged any individual with misconduct of any kind then the one who wrote the statement should be called so that the committee

might know what weight to give to that statement.

The chairman ruled, and correctly, I think, that the committee had no authority to investigate newspaper reports and newspaper articles. That is not difficult to go along with. That seems sound legally and in every other way. But that is not the situation to which my point was directed. Perhaps I did not make it clear. The situation yesterday did not raise the issue directly insofar as the individual was concerned, because no individual was by that article charged with misconduct. The article was being used to show that the recollection of the witness who was testifying before the committee was at fault.

On this point, and I would be glad to have the chairman of the committee comment on this, for as I view the hearings, he has conducted them fairly without any political tinge except possibly to show that the Eisenhower administration is a little more secretive than previous ones. However, I do not know of any executive department that has ever freely given any committee of Congress any information which would tend to reflect discredit upon the administration involved.

But this is the point, when a witness comes before a committee and then committee counsel or a member of the committee brings in and puts into the committee record a statement charging some misconduct on the part of the witness or a statement tends to substantiate some charge which has been made against either the department or an individual, the person who wrote that article should be required to come in and give the committee the source of his information. Otherwise we get uncorroborated, irresponsible statements on the record which may reflect and which at times do reflect upon a department or an individual who is under investigation, or whose name appears in the record.

Rule XI 25 (m) of the House provides:

> (m) If the committee determines that evidence or testimony at an investigative hearing may tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate any person, it shall—
>
> (1) receive such evidence or testimony in executive session;
>
> (2) afford such person an opportunity voluntarily to appear as a witness; and
>
> (3) receive and dispose of requests from such person to subpena additional witnesses.

The right of confrontation is a common law right guaranteed to one accused of a crime. The purpose of the sixth amendment reaffirming that right did not broaden it nor wipe out the exceptions nor can a State deny it—*Salinger* v. *U. S.* (272 U. S. C. 548). Nor is the right to confrontation limited to criminal trials or proceedings in Federal courts.

A conviction for contempt in a State court was reversed because the accused had not had opportunity to meet his accusers—*In re Oliver* (333 U. S. C. 257).

Because lawmakers should be especially careful to protect civil rights, congressional committees should not deny to anyone appearing before them the right to due process, the right to face and interrogate his accuser.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yes, I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. MOSS. First I want to thank the gentleman for his comment on the efforts of the chairman to keep the committee out of politics. I would, however, like to make one correction: We are not trying to prove that any administration is more secretive than any other; on the other hand, we are trying to look at facts.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. If the gentleman will let me comment there, that is a personal impression, that is all.

Mr. MOSS. The question the gentleman raises is purely an academic one, because I can envision no incident where the committee counsel would place in the record any charge that would become a basis for committee action.

The article referred to yesterday was not given the committee by a newspaper reporter but was taken by the staff from a newspaper for the information of the committee. I think the condition would be entirely different if a reporter referred an item to the committee for its study and consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

(By unanimous consent Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. In my opinion the issue is not an academic one. It will be with us a long, long time. My point is this, and I want to be sure I make myself understood. I agree with the chairman wholeheartedly that the committee has no authority to investigate the truth or falsity of the average newspaper editorial or news story. The individual, if there is an individual who is harmed, has his remedy at civil law, and sometimes under the criminal law. My point is this, where there is a newspaper article, be it editorial or news story, which reflects upon the Department or upon an individual and by referring to it or quoting from it or putting it into the record, in making that a part of the testimony, then my point is that having given evidence in the case the one who is responsible for the statement containing the article should be subject to cross examination so that we will know whether the report is factual or merely the expression of an opinion or just a figment of the imagination of the writer. Certainly a committee cannot accept as evidence an ex parte statement on a disputed issue of fact without giving the accused an opportunity to test the weight to be given it. The right to be confronted by the witness is as old as the common law itself. That is the point I am making.

Mr. MOSS. On that point specifically, an article placed in the record by counsel for the subcommittee or by any member of the committee can be objected to by any other Member. If the article is placed in there because committee counsel or a member of the committee personally clipped it from a newspaper, then I feel that the committee has no authority, and it would be highly improper for us to request the reporter who is in no way a party to the controversy to come in and disclose the source of his information.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. With all due respect to my chairman, there is a difference of opinion there. Making an article a part of the record automatically carries with it the right of the accused to be confronted by the witness. I think it involves a fundamental proposition, because by placing that article in the record it becomes evidence. Then the one who gives that evidence should, like any other witness who appears personally, be subject to cross examination. Otherwise, I may get an article in a paper, or I may come in with an affidavit, or statement, introduce it into the record with no opportunity on the part of anyone to question its truthfulness. Our rules permit the introduction in committee hearings of statements either sworn to or otherwise. The article or statement may be filled with vicious scurrilous charges, and if I as the author cannot be called then to give the source of my information to substantiate my charges, we get into the position where we are doing what our rules, and which I think commonsense and common decency forbid. We are letting someone be accused without the opportunity of being able to answer.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 2 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, it is my opinion, as it has been right along, that the committee has no authority to investigate the press. If the gentleman objects to an article and desires to request that a reporter be subpenaed, the gentleman can make that request and at that time the committee may determine whether or not it intends to go ahead pursuant to that request. But it is still the chairman's opinion that any such attempt to bring before the committee a reporter would be a highly improper procedure.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Even though his statement is put in the record?

Mr. MOSS. Even though his statement is put in the record. He has not requested that it be so printed.

CRITICISM OF EITHER HOUSE OF CONGRESS BY THE OTHER

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, our distinguished Speaker of the House, on June 25, called the attention of the House to a rule that forbids any Member of the House from inserting in the RECORD anything which might be a reflection upon a Member of the other body. I agree

with that rule. I think it is a good one, I think all Members of the House agree with that rule. However, Mr. Speaker, it seems to be a one-way street.

I should like to call the attention of the Speaker and the Members of the House to page A5384 of the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 9. I shall not refer by name to the Member of the other body who inserted the matter in the RECORD, but I will say he is one of the leaders of the majority in that body. He has inserted an editorial which I shall read part of as follows:

The death of the school construction bill in the House of Representatives on Thursday was nothing less than a national disaster. The measure was put to death by a combination of prejudice and politicking in an atmosphere of confusion and finagling discreditable to Democrats and Republicans alike, and to the House itself as a lawmaking body.

Mr. Speaker, as one Member of this body, I resent an editorial of that kind being inserted in the RECORD—which casts a reflection upon the House of Representatives—by a Member of the other body. I would suggest that the gentleman who has inserted that editorial, by reason of his leadership, could bring up a bill in the Senate himself. And, if he feels the way he does about it, he has been lax in his duty in not bringing that legislation before the Senate.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I am very glad that the gentleman from Ohio has brought this matter to the attention of the Speaker. It seems to me it is something which the Speaker might wish to take up with the Member of the other body in question and with the other body as a body. I call the attention of the Speaker to the fact that in the same issue on pages 11016 and 11017 another Member of the other body, whose name our rules do not permit us to disclose, not only inserted in the RECORD exactly the same editorial, which is something not permitted on our side of the Capitol, and I understand is not normally permitted in the other body, but also a complete rollcall coupled with an attack upon the Members of Congress who had voted for the Powell amendment and against the bill. Now, it so happens that his attack does not affect me personally. But, I do, on behalf of my colleagues whom he is attacking in that article, resent the attack. The particular Member making the attack in the other body happens to be a good friend of mine for whom I entertain personally a warm regard, but I think it should be called to his attention that such action on our side against Members of the other body would be criticized, and very properly so, by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and that his action may be violative of the principles of comity which should govern our relations. I think the gentleman from Ohio has performed a service by bringing this matter to the attention of the House.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The gentleman was referring to this article on page A5384, ignoring the children.

Mr. BOW. That is correct.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Let me say to the gentleman that I read that article when it came out, and it was what you would expect if you were familiar with the publishers or the public policy of the Washington Post.

Mr. BOW. But you would not expect a Member of the other body to use it as an indictment against this body for its official action.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Well, I would say that they were selecting a mighty poor witness. But I would not want to comment. The rules forbid any comment about what I would expect of the other body or the Members of it.

Mr. BOW. I am delighted the gentleman is respecting the rules of the House. That we both agree upon.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. As far as I can. I have difficulty sometimes, when I see something in the RECORD that has been put in over there. I have difficulty in abiding by the rules for two reasons: First, because you cannot comment under the rules upon what they do over there, and then there are laws against the use of certain words, kinds of words, that might factually but not with propriety be used about the Members.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I understand the House has already agreed to meet tomorrow at 10 o'clock.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That is correct.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield for a moment, the gentleman knows that our Members are very busy today. In the gentleman's opinion, will they be through with the tasks which they are trying to accomplish today in time to meet tomorrow at 10 o'clock?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I will say in response to the gentleman's query that I trust there will be a large attendance tomorrow at 10 o'clock. As I have already stated, the House has already agreed to convene at that time tomorrow.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. HAND, for 10 minutes today, his manuscript to be inserted following the other special orders of the day.

Mr. HESELTON, for 20 minutes, on Thursday and Friday next.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. MORANO (at the request of Mr. HAND) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois and to include additional matter.

Mr. MULTER and include extraneous matter.

Mr. DIXON (at the request of Mr. DAWSON of Utah).

Mr. DODD (at the request of Mr. HAYS of Arkansas) in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 26 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, July 11, 1956, at 10 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2051. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of the Federal home loan banks for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1955, pursuant to the Government Corporation Control Act (31 U. S. C. 841) and the Federal Home Loan Bank Act (12 U. S. C. 1421) (H. Doc. No. 444); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

2052. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report of the Department of the Interior on the Farwell Unit, Nebraska, of the Missouri River Basin project, pursuant to the provisions of section 9 (a) of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (H. Doc. No. 445); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

2053. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a proposed concession permit with Mrs. Arsena Robinson which, when executed by the regional director, region No. 3, National Park Service, will authorize Mrs. Robinson to provide accommodations, facilities, and services for the public within Timpanogos Cave National Monument, Utah, for a period of 5 years from January 1, 1956, pursuant to the act of July 1, 1953 (67 Stat. 271); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 584. Resolution waving points of order against H. R. 12138, a bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2648). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MADDEN: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 585. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 12080, a bill authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2656). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. TRIMBLE: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 586. Resolution for consideration of S. 3982, an act to provide for the maintenance of production of tungsten, as-

bestos, fluorspar, and columbium-tantalum in the United States, its Territories and possessions, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2657). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. KILDAY: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 5519. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Army to convey certain tracts of land in El Paso County, Tex. to the city of El Paso, Tex., in exchange for certain lands to be conveyed by the city of El Paso, Tex., to the United States Government; with amendment (Rept. No. 2669). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. VINSON: Committee on Armed Services. S. 976. An act to provide for the release of the right, title, and interest of the United States in a certain tract or parcel of land conditionally granted by it to the city of Montgomery, W. Va.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2670). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BURDICK: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 8617. A bill to validate certain payments of sea-duty pay made to naval personnel serving on board vessels in the Great Lakes during the period November 1, 1950, to October 31, 1953; with amendment (Rept. No. 2671). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee: Committee on Public Works. H. R. 8265. A bill relating to the use of storage space in the Buford Reservoir for the purpose of providing Gwinnett County, Ga., a regulated water supply; with amendment (Rept. No. 2672). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee: Committee on Public Works. H. R. 8940. A bill relating to the sale of water from the Hulah Reservoir to the city of Bartlesville, Okla; with amendment (Rept. No. 2673). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee: Committee on Public Works. H. R. 11702. A bill to provide for the sale of lands in reservoir areas under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Army for cottage-site development and use; without amendment (Rept. 2674). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RODINO: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 11907. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, with respect to fees of United States marshals; without amendment (Rept. No. 2675). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennnesee: Committee on Public Works. S. 1358. An act to authorize modification of the flood-control project for Missouri River Agricultural Levee Unit 513–512–R, Richardson County, Nebr.; without amendment (Rept. 2676). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FORRESTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1154. An act for the relief of Hal A. Marchant; without amendment (Rept. No. 2649). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FORRESTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1708. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Ernest M. Kersh; without amendment (Rept No. 2650). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DONOHUE: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 3150. An act for the relief of Sgt. and Mrs. Herbert G. Herman; without amendment (Rept. No. 2651). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1243. An act for the relief of Kyu Lee; with amendment (Rept. No. 2652). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1324. An act for the relief of Salvatore di Morello; with amendment (Rept. No. 2653). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1627. An act for the relief of Alexander Orlov and his wife, Maria Orlov; without amendment (Rept. No. 2654). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 3009. An act for the relief of Kiyoshi Kinoshita; with amendment (Rept. No. 2655). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 3473. An act for the relief of Kurt Johan Paro; without amendment (Rept. No. 2658). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 3579. An act for the relief of Elizabeth M. A. de Cuevas Faure; without amendment (Rept. No. 2659). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. House Joint Resolution 662. Joint resolution for the relief of certain relatives of United States citizens; with amendment (Rept. No. 2660). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FORRESTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2952. A bill for the relief of John H. Parker; with amendment (Rept. No. 2661). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FORRESTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4464. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Kathryn H. Wallace; with amendment (Rept. No. 2662). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FORRESTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5586. A bill for the relief of Otto B. Hauffe; without amendment (Rept. No. 2663). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FORRESTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 7162. A bill for the relief of T. W. Holt & Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2664). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FORRESTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 8056. A bill for the relief of Col. Adolph B. Miller; with amendment (Rept. No. 2665). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BURDICK: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 9028. A bill for the relief of Fred G. Nagle Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2666). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BURDICK: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 11822. A bill for the relief of Tom R. Hickman and Nannie Conley and husband, Jack Conley; with amendment (Rept. No. 2667). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. House Joint Resolution 642. Joint resolution to authorize and direct the Secretary of Agriculture to quitclaim certain property in Coahoma County, Miss., to the Home Demonstration Club of Rena Lara, Miss., Inc.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2668). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAIR:

H. R. 12166. A bill to repeal the act of February 18, 1896, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H. R. 12167. A bill to authorize the payment to local governments of sums in lieu of taxes and special assessments with respect to certain Federal real property, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H. R. 12168. A bill to amend section 4 (a) of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, as amended; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HYDE:

H. R. 12169. A bill to establish the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal National Historical Park and to provide for the administration and maintenance of a parkway, in the State of Maryland, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. JUDD:

H. R. 12170. A bill to remove the present $1,000 limitation which prevents the Secretary of the Navy from settling certain claims arising out of the crash of a naval aircraft at the Wold-Chamberlin Air Field, Minneapolis, Minn.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LIPSCOMB:

H. R. 12171. A bill to authorize the payment to local governments of sums in lieu of taxes and special assessments with respect to certain Federal real property, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 12172. A bill to exempt certain shipments of farm produce from the tax on the transportation of property; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOSS:

H. R. 12173. A bill to authorize the payment to local governments of sums in lieu of taxes and special assessments with respect to certain Federal real property, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H. R. 12174. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to impose a graduated tax on the taxable income of corporations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 12175. A bill to provide for the transfer of the Civil Service Commission Building in the District of Columbia to the Regents of the Smithsonian Institution for use in housing the National Collection of Fine Arts and National Portrait Gallery, to provide for the international interchange of art and craft works, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. WAINWRIGHT:

H. R. 12176. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Federal Advisory Council on the Arts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. YOUNG:

H. R. 12177. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934, so as to direct the Federal Communications Commission to provide for the licensing of television reflector facilities and VHF translator facilities; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BONNER:

H. Con. Res. 263. Concurrent resolution authorizing additional copies of the hearing on Labor-Management Problems of the American Merchant Marine; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. EVINS:

H. R. 12178. A bill for the relief of Col. Benjamin Axelroad; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOSMER:

H. R. 12179. A bill for the relief of Jael Mercades; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 12180. A bill for the relief of Walter Schik; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 680. Joint resolution to waive certain provisions of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 681. Joint resolution to waive the provision of section 212 (a) (6) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 682. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 683. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Polish Embassy Reception

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. DODD
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 10, 1956

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, in company with many of my colleagues, I received an invitation to a reception to be held at the Polish Embassy in Washington, D. C., on July 23 "in celebration of the national holiday of the Polish People's Republic."

I trust that no Member of Congress will attend this so-called celebration, for it would be shameful in my opinion if any Member of Congress, by so much as his presence, participated in a celebration marking the death of freedom and justice in Poland.

Mr. Speaker, I have written a letter to the Polish Ambassador refusing this invitation, and in my letter, I referred to the fact that 7 years ago I had refused an honor offered by this same Government.

I wish to make my own position a matter of record, and because I hope that my letter will be of interest to my colleagues, I include here a copy of it which reads as follows:

JULY 12, 1956.

Ambassador ROMUALD SPASOWSKI,
Embassy of the Polish People's Republic, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. AMBASSADOR: I have received your invitation to a reception "in celebration of the national holiday of the Polish People's Republic." In good conscience, I cannot and will not accept your invitation.

My reasons for so declining were made clear in a letter I sent to your predecessor, Ambassador Winiewica on April 23, 1949. In that letter I refused to accept the Officer's Cross of the Order of Polonia Restituta which was tendered to me in recognition of my efforts at the Nuremberg war crimes trial.

In the letter refusing the decoration, I stated, in part, as follows: "The record of your government in both domestic and foreign affairs is shockingly similar to the record of the Nazi tyrants as established in Nuremberg. Now the people of Poland are under the heel of a new tyranny which, like its evil predecessor, oppresses religious groups, terrorizes political opponents, and makes a mockery of the freedoms for which so many brave men and women gave their lives."

Now, more than 7 years later, I am even more firmly convinced that I was right in my expressions about your government.

Further in the letter I stated, "My great respect and admiration for the Polish people is undiminished by the misconduct of its present government." The anti-Communist uprising in Poznan less than 2 weeks ago by the citizens of that historic city who were willing to fight tanks with their bare hands for bread and freedom, has increased the already great respect and admiration that I have always felt toward the people of Poland.

It is my considered opinion, Mr. Ambassador, that the courage and love of freedom of the Polish people will once again see Poland a free nation. When that day arrives, and Poland has a legitimate and just and truly representative government, I will deem it a great honor to be invited to its Embassy.

Yours truly,

THOMAS J. DODD,
Member of Congress.

Hollow Celebration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT P. MORANO
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 10, 1956

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the text of a letter which I wrote to His Excellency Romuald Spasowski, the Polish Ambassador to the United States, in reply to an invitation to attend a reception in celebration of the national holiday of the Polish People's Republic on July 23.

My first thought upon receiving this invitation for the Communist celebration was the picture of thousands of dispirited Poles, men, women, and children, faced with the threat of ultimate starvation in a city called Poznan—a city supposedly flourishing under the Communist "people's republic," the founding of which will be celebrated on July 23.

This is the "people's republic" government which has refused the humane offer of the United States to provide food for these starving people of Poznan.

It is the same "people's republic" which turned tanks and guns on the oppressed humans of that city, humans whose only crime was that they dared to claim the rightful heritage of all mankind—the right to be free.

I am sure there will be no dancing in the streets of Poznan on July 23.

More than likely the citizens of Poznan will spend the day in quiet prayer—prayer for the end of the "people's republic"—prayer for the return of their freedom and their dignity.

Following is the text of my letter to the Polish Ambassador:

JULY 9, 1956.

His Excellency ROMUALD SPASOWSKI,
Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary, Polish Embassy, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. AMBASSADOR: Mrs. Morano and I regret that we are unable to accept your invitation to attend the reception in celebration of the national holiday of the Polish People's Republic on July 23.

Were we able to attend, I am certain that my conscience would not permit me to enter into the spirit of the "celebration" knowing in my heart that across the seas the people of Poland are in agonizing quest for food for their bodies and freedom for their souls.

I could not in good conscience accept your hospitality, the offerings of the festive table and bar, full knowing that in Poznan today valiant men, women, and children are facing starvation because they dared to seek the freedom willed them by God.

What a true celebration it would be if you could urge your government to reconsider, and on this day you, Mr. Ambassador, were able to announce the acceptance of the United States Government's humane offering of food for the hungry people of Poznan. This, indeed, would be cause for a celebration.

And the true celebration will come, I am sure, when the shackles of oppression are fully lifted, and the Poles regain their national prestige and the pride of a free people; in truth, that day will be a genuine national holiday in which your people too will join the celebration, wholeheartedly and with the same spirit of free men and women with which they formerly celebrated their national holiday of May 3.

In this celebration all Americans would happily participate.

Sincerely,

ALBERT P. MORANO,
Member of Congress.

Harry S. Ditchburne

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 10, 1956

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep grief that I announce the death last week in Chicago of Harry S. Ditchburne, a veteran Republican leader and in 1933 the nominee of his party for State's attorney of Cook County. From 1927 to 1933 he was the ace prosecutor on the staff of the State's attorney. While we were of different political parties and in many widely publicized murder trials of the era were on opposing sides, he always for the prosecution, I always for the defense, we held for each other a feeling of esteem and of affection. He was a great prosecutor, one of the all-time greats in the history of the criminal courts of Cook County, thorough in preparation, resourceful in presentation, impressing juries with his sincerity and his fairness.

It has been a quarter of a century or more since Harry Ditchburne and I were